

EXHIBIT K

Dalton, Amy

Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 11:36 AM
To: 'Hornick, John'
Cc: Walker, Joshua; dan.hampton@hklaw.com; Hawk, Robert B.; Grabow, Troy; mthaler@proskauer.com; Hart, Pat; Nagel, Robert; Guy, Hopkins; Joczek; Chatterjee, I. Neel; Sadasivan, Bhanu; Esquenet, Margaret
Subject: RE: March 15, 2006 Letter

John:

As you know, the Facebook Defendants have prepared a source log for ConnectU's benefit of the information on the devices that you refer to. Moreover, even now, we continue to search for any additional examples of relevant code. To suggest, as you do, that you cannot provide the identity of the relevant program which "deletes old versions of code" to which you refer on Device TFB 371-02 because it is "work product" is simply specious. In point of fact, by making the assertion that such a program exists in both your arguments and in your Summary, and yet not further identifying the program, we believe you have misled the Court through the use of innuendo. To the best of our knowledge, the only program you possibly can be referring to is standard version control software, the purpose of which (as we are certain you are aware) is not to delete code, but to track versions. We are confident any expert, including any appointed by the Court, would readily acknowledge this fact. Therefore, ConnectU's silence in response to our reasonable inquiry suggests that rather than protect "work product," it has raised this particular allegation in order to mislead the Court as to the purpose of the program to which you refer.

You also have repeatedly suggested that the way the Facebook Defendants have conducted discovery is improper, which is false. In point of fact, I have more than once asked if you are prepared to advise the Court that you searched and produced all electronic devices of both ConnectU and those belonging to the Counter-Defendants with the same rigor you have demanded of Facebook. Specifically, I have asked more than once whether you too are prepared to have such devices imaged to ensure all earlier versions of Harvard Connection code are produced. In July you said you needed to "think about it" when I asked if by demanding imaging you were prepared to do the same. Similarly, you never responded to my renewed request set forth in my February 26, 2006 letter that you assure both Facebook and the Court that ConnectU and the counter-defendants have, in fact, undertaken the same imaging demands you have directed to Facebook. I would appreciate such a response.

Sincerely,

Monte Cooper